

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of June 12, 2013

Members Present: Hillary Cole, Nan Chase, Brian Cook, J. Ray Elingburg, David Carpenter, Woodard Farmer, Tracey Rizzo, Brendan Ross, Jo Stephenson, Capi Wampler

Members Absent: David Nutter, Pat Cothran

Staff: Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner, Jannice Ashley

Public: Jeremy and Geneve Bacon, Bryan Moffitt

Call to Order: Chair Cole calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum present.

Adoption of Minutes: Commissioner Wampler moves to adopt the November 14, 2012 minutes as written.
Second by: Commissioner Chase
Vote for: ALL

Consent Agenda:

None

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Amy Hornaday
Subject Property: 134 Cherokee Road/Possum Trot
Hearing Date: June 12, 2013
Historic District: Albemarle Park
PIN: 9649.97-4376
Zoning District: RS-4
Other Permits: Building

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report. She notes the applicant has submitted additional information, and revised the application to ask for the removal of four trees.</p> <p>Property Description: Possum Trot is two story a rustic shingle style cottage on a brick foundation, built in 1913.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct a new 3.5-4' high retaining wall running parallel to the front foundation wall, 6' from forward of the foundation wall. Construct a 2nd wall above it to create a terrace as shown on the site plan. Walls will be masonry with rock veneer to match existing walls on site. Replace crumbling concrete steps with natural stones and boulders to create a terraced decent. Renovations include the following: 1) remove infill</p>
-----------------------	---

	<p>wall on rear “L” addition. 2) install 3 new wood casement windows, SDL on 1st floor east elevation and 3) new wood 6 over 6, double hung, SDL window in previous opening on 2nd level east elevation. Extend porch overhang with new wood post over entryway. Install new roof with <i>Barkwood</i> Timberline shingles. Remove non-original rear chimney. All work per attached approved plans and specifications. Remove two locusts and two ailanthus trees from front yard per attached site plan. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <p>Need stone samples and veneer photographs</p> <p>The guidelines for Vegetation: Trees from the <i>Chestnut Liberty Design Review Guidelines</i> which state that maintenance of the existing canopy of mature trees along streets and in front yards is a high priority and the guidelines for repair and remodeling work found on page 23-24 of the <i>Architectural Design Guidelines and Standards for Albemarle Park</i> were used to evaluate this request</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval for the following reasons.</p> <p>Suggested Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ailanthus trees requested for removal are invasive and the locusts are younger volunteer trees that were not part of Samuel Parsons’s original design. 2. The proposed renovations are on the type 3 façade, and are compatible with the existing historic structure in scale and materials.
Applicant(s)	<p>Amy Hornaday, property owner, offers to answer questions. She shows a sample stone from her property.</p> <p>Chair Cole asks for details on the terracing, and whether there is a bridge over the dry creek bed (<i>no</i>). Ms. Hornaday says the terrace will be left natural. Chair Cole asks if they will plant additional trees (<i>no</i>).</p> <p>Commissioner Carpenter notes there are several styles of masonry in the existing walls. He asks which style will be replicated. Commissioners discuss these, a dry stack pattern is thought to be the oldest. Ms. Hornaday says they will try to replicate it.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
Jeremy Bacon	Mr. Bacon lives at 50 Cherokee Road. He says he and his wife Geneve know the applicant and the architect, and they have no concerns about the project.

Commission Comments/Discussion

<p>Attorney Ashley asks why the <i>Chestnut Liberty Design Review Guidelines</i> were used for review. Ms. Merten replies they are referenced in the Albemarle Park guidelines as applicable for landscape review.</p>
--

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – existing main and upper level floor plans ; Exhibit C – existing partial rear and left side elevations ; Exhibit D – proposed main and upper level floor plans ; Exhibit E – proposed section thru side entry and right side elevation; Exhibit F – twelve photographs of existing building and site ; Exhibit G – front landscape plan; Exhibit H –four photographs of landscape details ; Exhibit I – proposed Alternate B first floor plan and right side elevation; Exhibit J – revised proposed section thru side entry; Exhibit K – description and site plan for tree removal ; Exhibit L – 2012 property survey (*Exhibits I–L received 6/12/13*); Exhibit M – sample of stone from the property; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members except Commissioner Elingburg;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30th day of May, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 30th day of May, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits N and O.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to construct a new 3.5-4’ high retaining wall running parallel to the front foundation wall, 6’ from forward of the foundation wall. Construct a 2nd wall above it to create a terrace as shown on the site plan. Stone wall facing will match older dry stack pattern. Walls will be masonry with rock veneer to match existing walls on site. Replace crumbling concrete steps with natural stones and boulders to create a terraced descent. Renovations include the following: 1) remove infill wall on rear “L” addition. 2) install 3 new wood casement windows, SDL on 1st floor east elevation and 3) new wood 6 over 6, double hung, SDL window in previous opening on 2nd level east elevation. Extend porch overhang with new wood post over entryway. Install new roof with *Barkwood* Timberline shingles. Remove non-original rear chimney. All work per attached approved plans and specifications. Remove two locusts and two ailanthus trees from front yard per attached site plan. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Vegetation: Trees from the *Chestnut Liberty Design Review Guidelines* which state that maintenance of the existing canopy of mature trees along streets and in front yards is a high priority and the guidelines for repair and remodeling work found on page 23-24 of the *Architectural Design Guidelines and Standards for Albemarle Park* were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The ailanthus trees requested for removal are invasive and the locusts are younger volunteer trees that were not part of Samuel Parsons’s original design.
 - b. The proposed renovations are on the type 3 façade, and are compatible with the existing historic structure in scale and materials.
 - c. The retaining walls and landscape plans are compatible with historic wall construction and Samuel Parson’s original landscape design.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Albemarle Park Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Wampler

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Wampler

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: 63 Brooke Street LLC/ Bryan Moffit
Subject Property: 63 Brook Street
Hearing Date: June 12, 2013
Historic District: Biltmore Village
PIN: 9647.79-5641
Zoning District: CB-II
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten reports the applicant has incorporated suggestions from the Preliminary hearing into his latest design. She shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Mid 20th century one story strip type commercial development, which is non contributing to the Biltmore Village Historic District. The proposed new structure will be located in the High Density Cottage Area as outlined in the Biltmore Village Development Plan. The residential portion of the project located on Warren Ave. is not part of the Biltmore Village Historic District and is not part of the HRC review.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Demolish existing one story non-contributing structure and construct a new 2- story, 24,700 sq. ft. mixed use building, per attached plans and specifications. The new structure will be elevated above the flood plain on a brick (<i>Hanson-Old Richmond</i>) foundation. The primary building material is pebbledash (<i>Shenandoah Taupe</i>) with some fiber cement shingle detailing on the 2nd floor gables. Roof will be (<i>Tudor Brown</i>) composition asphalt shingles with a 12/12 pitch. Roof will have hip configuration with front side and end gables, rafter and exposed rafter ends. Windows will be aluminum clad, SDL with 6, 9 and 12 lite configurations per the drawings and specifications. Storefront will be aluminum clad. Details include: cornices, wood brackets, lintels, brick quoins and 8" window and door surrounds. All trim boards will be fiber cement. Railings will be black wrought iron. Sidewalks will be <i>Pine</i></p>
-----------------------	---

	<p><i>Hall</i> brick pavers in the basket weave or running bond pattern. Exterior lighting per attached approved specifications. Biltmore Village street lights identified as LF on site plan. Pebbledash retaining wall will be a maximum of 20 ft. in height at southeast corner. Landscaping per attached approved landscape plan. Parking will be located to the east of the building and screened with buffer plantings Dumpster enclosures will be wood and brick. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brick sidewalk should be in basket weave or running bond pattern. 2. Need details on water meter enclosure. 3. Confirm material and landscaping for retaining wall. <p>The Guidelines for New Construction in Contemporary Styles found on pages 13-15 in Chapter 4, Book 3 <i>Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions</i> and Guidelines for Site Design found on pages 23-26, Chapter 5, in Book 1, <i>Biltmore Village General Design Guidelines and Policies</i> adopted on October 1, 1988 and the Biltmore Village Development Plan were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval for the following reasons.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project is setback 5 feet behind the sidewalk in accordance to the reduced setback suggested for the high density cottage area in the Biltmore Village Development Plan and is pedestrian oriented at ground level, with steps and awnings and overhangs to suggest entry porches. 2. The new structure conforms to the guidelines for high density cottage in the BV Development Plan with architecture referencing the cottage style and repetitive roof bays to echo multiple cottages. 3. Minimal onsite parking is located on east side of project facing away from the district at its edge and oriented to increase the buffer area and minimize the impact to the district.
<p>Applicant(s)</p>	<p>Bryan Moffitt, architect, offers to answer questions. He submits specifications for an alternate lighting fixture. He discusses the gable forms he has added to the design, and notes the brick bases and quoins match other Village cottages. He explains changes he has made to the landscape design, says crossvine will be planted at the base of the retaining wall.</p> <p>Chair Cole asks how the vines will be adhered to the wall. Mr. Moffitt says there will be 10' of evergreens to start, perhaps glossy abelia. Chair Cole thinks he will need something taller, suggests columnar boxwoods. She notes the planting bed is very narrow. She asks about the bed between the parking lot and the building (<i>lawn</i>).</p> <p>Commissioner Cook asks about the material for the wall. Mr. Moffitt says it will be rounded riverstone pebbledash. He says he will be using the same</p>

	<p>contractor (as 26 All Souls Crescent), and this should make the refining the pebbledash easier.</p> <p>Ms. Merten notes the 5' setbacks adhere to the high density cottage area in the Biltmore Village development plan. She notes that it would be impossible to park behind the building on this site and the parking configuration proposed has minimum impact due to the angle from the street and landscape buffer.</p> <p>Commissioner Rizzo asks about the water meter enclosure. Mr. Moffitt says they are working to have a vault below ground and if so they will come back to staff with details on enclosure, but it may be above ground. Commissioners discuss details on awnings, railings, color of the mortar (<i>buff</i>), brick pattern for the sidewalk (<i>running bond</i>). Mr. Moffitt says the parking lot will be asphalt with concrete aprons.</p> <p>Concern is expressed about the top of the retaining wall. Mr. Moffitt says it will be modeled on geotechnical engineers' specifications. He says small trees could be planted above, silverbells and sourwoods. He notes it is a north facing slope.</p> <p>Chair Cole asks about the sash color (<i>to be determined</i>) and railings on the 2nd story. Mr. Moffitt says they will be composite, painted to look like wood. The railings on the first level are wrought iron. He says the railing materials reflect the dual nature of the building, metal relates to the commercial level, wood to the residential. Commissioner Cook agrees.</p> <p>Commissioner Carpenter asks about the quions, Mr. Moffitt says he has modeled them after the Vanderbilt/Biltmore Office building and the church.</p>
--	--

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

<p>Commissioner Elingburg compliments the design, says it will be a positive extension of the Village.</p> <p>Commissioner Carpenter says he is still concerned about the retaining wall, and wonders what material could make it better. Ms. Merten says there is nothing in the guidelines, that landscaping to hide it is the only option. Commissioner Cook suggests it be made a darker color, to blend in with the upper portion of the building. Mr. Moffitt notes it will only be half as tall as the one at 26 All Souls Crescent.</p> <p>Commissioner Ross says she likes the initial lighting fixture more than the alternate submitted. There is discussion of which one matches Village style best. Commissioner Cook says the open design of the first is preferable. Mr. Moffitt notes the first one meets the dark sky, full cut-off night/light pollution requirements. He says he will stick with his first plan, but will continue to look for other options.</p>
--

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description ; Exhibit B – new construction worksheet; Exhibit C – lighting fixture specifications and drawing of Biltmore Lanterns ; Exhibit D – village location plan ; Exhibit E – development data; Exhibit F – exterior materials; Exhibit G – existing site plan; Exhibit H – proposed site plan ; Exhibit I – landscape plan ; Exhibit J – 1st and 2nd floor plans showing rentable area ; Exhibit K – North, East and West elevations; Exhibit L – drawings of proposed retaining wall; Exhibit M – fourteen photographs of existing area and cottage details; Exhibit N – three existing photographs of site with corresponding renderings of proposed project; Exhibit O – large scale landscape plan; Exhibit P – alternate light fixture specifications; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members.

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30th day of May, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 30th day of May, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits Q and R.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to demolish existing one story non-contributing structure and construct a new 2- story, 24,700 sq. ft. mixed use building, per attached plans and specifications. The new structure will be elevated above the flood plain on a brick (*Hanson-Old Richmond*) foundation. The primary building material is pebbledash (*Shenandoah Taupe*) with some fiber cement shingle detailing on the 2nd floor gables. Roof will be (*Tudor Brown*) composition asphalt shingles with a12/12 pitch. Roof will have hip configuration with front side and end gables, rafter and exposed rafter ends. Windows will be aluminum clad, SDL with 6, 9 and 12 lite configurations per the drawings and specifications. Storefront will be aluminum clad. Details include: cornices, wood brackets, lintels, brick quoins and 8” window and door surrounds. Trim color will be Appalachian Brown. All trim boards will be fiber cement. Railings will be black wrought iron. Sidewalks will be *Pine Hall* brick pavers in the basket weave or running bond pattern. Exterior lighting per attached approved specifications. Biltmore Village street lights identified as LF on site plan. Pebbledash retaining wall will be a maximum of 15 ft. in height at southeast corner. Landscaping per attached approved landscape plan. Parking will be located to the east of the building and screened with buffer plantings. Dumpster enclosures will be wood and brick. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the Guidelines for New Construction in Contemporary Styles found on pages 13-15 in Chapter 4, Book 3 *Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions*, the Guidelines for Site Design found on pages 23-26, Chapter 5, and the Guidelines for Illumination found on pages 45-46, Chapter 8 in Book 1, *Biltmore Village General Design Guidelines and Policies* adopted on October 1, 1988 and the Biltmore Village Development Plan were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The project is setback 5 feet behind the sidewalk in accordance to the reduced setback suggested for the high density cottage area in the Biltmore Village Development Plan and

is pedestrian oriented at ground level, with steps and awnings and overhangs to suggest entry porches.

- b. The new structure conforms to the guidelines for high density cottage in the BV Development Plan with architecture referencing the cottage style and repetitive roof bays to echo multiple cottages.
 - c. Minimal onsite parking is located on east side of project facing away from the district at its edge and oriented to increase the buffer area and minimize the impact to the district.
 - d. Retaining wall materials are compatible with the historic character of the Village and will be covered with vegetation.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

With the following conditions:

1. Revised plans and specifications will be submitted for staff review to show:

- a) evergreens that will conceal the wall
- b) water enclosure
- c) mortar color
- d) treatment for wall cap on East side as it returns to the street
- e) trim color for window sash
- f) asphalt on parking area
- g) railing detail on second floor
- h) wall color

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Preliminary Review:

None

Other Business:

National Register nomination, Bruce A. and June L. Elmore Lustron House

Ms. Merten asks for comments and explains the review process. Commissioners are in favor of the nomination.

Executive Committee clarification

Commissioner Wampler reports Brendan Ross will be 1st Vice Chair, Jo Stephenson the 2nd Vice Chair and Nan Chase 3rd Vice Chair. Ms. Merten notes the immediate past chair serves on the

Executive Committee even if they are not on the Board.

Fundraising for CLG grant

Ms. Merten reports HRC has been awarded a CLG grant for \$15,000 by SHPO to produce a Preservation Plan, but a \$10,000 matching grant from Buncombe County is unlikely and not in their current budget. At the most, they may give \$4500 for operating expenses. Ms. Merten has to come up with the \$10,000 matching amount very quickly. She wants to know how committed the Commission is to trying to raise these funds. She notes the actual money does not have to be in hand until the end of August 2014, but commitment for the funds must be in place before the paperwork is signed.

Ms. Merten explains steps in the grant process. First, the HRC enters into a contract with SHPO; this contract details how a consultant will be hired to produce the plan. Then a RFP is issued to hire a consultant, hopefully by August. The consultant will have a year to finish the work. Then HRC pays the consultant, then will be reimbursed by the State. Typically there are stages to these payments. Ms. Merten says the City's budget situation is changing from day to day. She first thought it might be best to decline the grant and wait until there might be a more favorable response from the County, when the Parks and Cultural Authority is created, but now does not think that will happen.

Discussion follows about fundraising methods and possibilities. Ms. Merten asks if one of the Commissioners would be willing to head a fundraising committee, and says she had some success by just mentioning the need today (John Cram gave \$500). This leaves \$9500 that needs to be raised quickly. She says there are some funds already in place from the sale of Cabins and Castles (\$2319), and \$1000 from the Eagle/Market Place project. She notes there is another grant she could apply for from the National Trust, if she has funds to match that \$5000. There may be proceeds from the Albemarle Park book in the Spring.

Commissioner Carpenter asks for details about the use of the money. Ms. Merten replies all the funds will be used to produce a Preservation Plan. She says with a limited budget of \$28,000, there would need to be a focus on specific problems in the community that are facing preservation, such as density in historic districts. She says there has been a program in place for thirty years, and it is working well, but there are challenges. She thinks it would be helpful to educate the community about Preservation and involve new people. Another goal could be to integrate the Preservation process with City Planning. She notes currently they are structured differently and operate separately.

Attorney Ashley notes the Commission would have to certify that they will have the funds in hand, the agreement could not be signed without this confirmation. She suggests approaching neighborhoods that have historic homes that may not be in local historic districts.

Commissioner Wampler asks if these donations would be tax deductible (*yes*). She suggests Ms. Merten provide some bullet points that would help the Commissioners with the outreach. Atty. Ashley says to make sure to mention that \$15,000 has already been awarded, but will be lost if it can't be matched.

Commissioner Carpenter moves to adjourn the meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Rizzo

Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 5:45 pm.